

1759
5
*SHOULD RITUALISM BE TOLERATED IN THE
CHURCH OF ENGLAND?*

A SERMON

PREACHED IN

CHRIST CHURCH, BELLEVILLE,

BY THE RECTOR,

REV. JOHN R. JONES,

ON

SUNDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 7TH, 1877.

BEING A SLIGHT ACCOUNT OF SOME OF THE WORDS AND ACTIONS
OF THE MEN FOR WHOM TOLERATION WAS LATELY ASKED
BY THE LORD BISHOP OF FREDERICTON.

PUBLISHED BY REQUEST.

BELLEVILLE :
PRINTED AT THE INTELLIGENCER STEAM PRINTING HOUSE.

1877.

2212
877
577

4

*SHOULD RITUALISM BE TOLERATED IN THE
CHURCH OF ENGLAND?*

A SERMON

PREACHED IN

CHRIST CHURCH, BELLEVILLE,

BY THE RECTOR,

REV. JOHN R. JONES,

ON

SUNDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 7TH, 1877.

BEING A SLIGHT ACCOUNT OF SOME OF THE WORDS AND ACTIONS
OF THE MEN FOR WHOM TOLERATION WAS LATELY ASKED
BY THE LORD BISHOP OF FREDERICTON.

PUBLISHED BY REQUEST.

BELLEVILLE :
PRINTED AT THE INTELLIGENCER STEAM PRINTING HOUSE.

1877.

F5013
1877
J 77

II PETER, II. 1.—“But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you.”

It is the pride and glory of the Church of England, that the platform upon which her true members stand, is a broad and liberal one ; that (unlike some other denominations) allowance is made for certain schools of thought, which differ somewhat from each other in their interpretation of portions of Scripture, parts of the Prayer Book, and the rules and regulations of the Church.

While Rome does not make any allowance, but openly condemns private judgment by her claim to infallibility ; while (like her) some Protestant and professedly liberal denominations put the *dictum* upon, and, if necessary, expel the unfortunate member who may in the slightest degree presume to differ from their preconceived ideas of theological truth; the Church of England claims to be, and is in very fact, a *liberal* communion, making fair allowances for every opinion that can even pretend to a foothold upon her comprehensive platform, and giving due weight to the utterances of the various schools of thought, that are embraced by her extensive boundaries.

For this reason we find her clergy and laity divided into *three* great sections, (*parties* if you will,) viz. : the “Evangelical,” the “High Church,” and what is now generally known as the “Broad Church.” Every man of common sense, must admit the existence, within the pale, of these three parties ; must also admit their recognition by the Bishops and Church as a body, and acknowledge that they meet, and in many things work more or less together, though at times one may rather severely censure and criticize the ways and actions of the other.

To show you how it is possible for these parties to honourably maintain their position in the Church, and as an illustration of the scope allowed for private judgment, allow me a few examples, though many such could be given,—

(a) To be an honest member of the English Church, a man *must* believe in *Episcopacy*, but can take various views as to its power and authority; one simply allowing it as a most desirable form of church government, but not necessarily Divine; another being a firm adherent to "Apostolic Succession" and the Divine commencement and continuation, as links in a chain, of the orders of Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons.

(b) A true Church member *must* believe in Infant Baptism, but can take two or three different views, as to the efficacy of Baptism, or the sense in which the word *regeneration* is used.

(c) The Sacrament of the "Lord's Supper" is *per se* an article of the faith, but on the spiritual benefits derived from, and the express nature of the Sacrament, there are held and allowed different opinions.

But be particular to observe, that, while a certain range is allowed for liberty of thought, there is a *limit*; a line so distinctly marked by the Church, that the most casual observer cannot fail to distinguish it, and which if a man oversteps, he *ipso facto* excommunicates himself; and though, by a law quibble, he may maintain his office and position, or like Bishop Colenso, who actually excommunicated, holds on to the temporalities of his See,—he is in reality no more a true member of the Church of England, than the most extreme dissenter that ever lived.

It now becomes my duty, to give as examples, a few instances, in which the line marks off forbidden ground.

(a) Respecting the Lord's Supper, concerning the benefits and nature of which, differences of opinion are, as I before remarked, allowed to a certain extent,—the Church distinctly states, that,—

"Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by holy writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions."

"The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped."—Art. XXVIII.

Again,—

“The sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits.”—Art. XXXI.

Once more, at the conclusion of the communion service, we find the following:—

“No adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread or Wine there bodily received.”

There is no mistaking the drift of this language, nothing could be plainer or more distinctly stated; so a man going openly in violation of the above, and teaching what is thereby condemned, has *no right* to call himself a member of the Church of England, or remain within her communion.

(*b*) Again, with regard to the state of departed souls, whatever views may be held, we find the following, amongst other doctrines, absolutely condemned by the Church:

“The Romish doctrine concerning Purgatory, Pardons, Worshipping and Adoration, as well of images as of reliques, and also invocations of Saints, is a fond thing vainly invented and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God.”—Art. XXII.

Then in strong opposition to the Roman doctrine of “Justification by works.” We have the following stated, as that of the Church of England:

“We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour-Jesus Christ by Faith, and not for our own works or deservings; wherefore that we are justified by Faith ONLY, is a most wholesome doctrine and very full of comfort.”—Art. XI.

“Good works which are the *fruits of faith*, and follow after justification, cannot put away our sins.”—Art. XII.

Numerous such like instances, where the Church has spoken decidedly, could be given, but these will answer my purpose, as time will not allow of my bringing all forward.

One point now, I unflinchingly maintain, which is this: No *honest* man, standing upon the theological platform of the English Church, will think of preaching, within her pale, the doctrines held by her to be false, and openly repudiated in her Articles; nor will, on the other hand, neglect enforcing the doctrines pr

scribed. If he does either the *one* or the *other*, he has no right to remain, or be allowed to remain, within her communion.

Allow me also to remark, that all sincere churchmen are agreed in opinion respecting the Reformation—neither the “High Church,” the “Evangelical,” or the “Broad Church” schools, will call the Reformation “*a mistake*.” They may not agree in sentiment with every Reformer, or approve of every act done; but all will maintain, that the Reformation, as an event in the history of our Church, was one of the most glorious that ever happened her communion, in its thorough purification, from all that we consider worse than useless in doctrine and ceremonial, and its establishment in our midst of “*civil and religious*” liberty.

But I come now to a certain class, that hold on to the temporalities of the church, and call themselves churchmen, though there will be no difficulty whatever, in proving, from their own words and actions, that they are nothing more than “*false teachers*,” who have as much right to remain, and as good a claim to the title, as any *Colenso* that ever took part in her services.

The men, who make up this class, have, from their teaching and practices, shown themselves little better than “wolves in sheep’s clothing.” They have set at defiance all law, showered tirades of abuse upon every one bearing the name of Protestant; split up families; ruined congregations; published obscene and lewd books; have had no hesitation in denouncing the Reformation, as the greatest mistake that ever happened; and, by both open and underhand practices, are boldly endeavoring to bring the church back to the darkness of mediævalism; men, who openly preach the doctrines of Rome, while eating the bread of a Protestant Church.

I refer to the modern *Ritualists*. A few extracts from their writings, and a short account of some of their present practices, will show what claim they have to true church membership.

Going a few years back in the Ritualistic history, we come to a lecture on Innovations, delivered by Dr. Littledale, in which he designates our Reformers as “*A set of miscreants and utterly unredeemed villains.*”

We also find one of their organs, the *Church News*, of Feb 19, 1868, saying as follows :

“What we should like to know—Has the Church of England to do with the Spirit and principles of the Reformers, except to get rid of them as soon as possible? We will have nothing to do with such a set.”

Another paper, the *Union Review*, says :

“The work going on in England is an earnest and carefully organized attempt on the part of a rapidly increasing body of priests and laymen to bring our Church and Country up to the full standard of Catholic faith and practice, and eventually plead for her union with the *See of St. Peter*.”

“We are weekly praying in behalf of the Holy Father, and for restored Communion with the See of St. Peter.”

The same paper, page 411, says, “we give the people the real doctrine of the *Mass*; the name will come by and by, so with regard to the cultus (worship) of the Virgin, we are one with Roman Catholics in faith, and we have a common foe to fight.”

Of course the foe meant, is the *Protestantism* of the Church.

Again, in the “*Church News*,” November, 1867, there appeared the following :—

“Protestantism, as a living force, as a proselytizing power, is extinct. Its work is done; we must increase, Protestants must decrease. Justification by faith, the *most immoral* of Protestant dogmas, has run its tether, and happily died of self-strangulation.”

In the “*Church Times*,” (the chief English Ritualistic paper) of January 28th, 1870, appeared the following language, in reference to the distinctive doctrines of the Reformation,—

“We are busy in hunting them down, and have no intention of foregoing the chase till we have extirpated them.” *

These Jesuits have even spoken of the thirty-nine articles (the Protestant character of which they do not like) as “the forty stripes save one.”

Coming now to our own day, I consider it hardly necessary, to

* NOTE.—These quotations were also given by the Bishop of Huron in his bold denunciation of Ritualism before the Synod of that Diocese.—See Primary Address, June, 1872.

give quotations from their various writings and speeches. Why I might continue doing so for hours, and still it would be the same language just read, and even stronger, if anything could be stronger, in abuse of our Protestant doctrines and principles. What this terrible Jesuitical party has to-day done for the religion and morality of the country, has been lately laid bare by the exposure of their work "The Priest in Absolution," of which the less said the better, for no man or woman, except utterly depraved, could read it without disgust and astonishment.

To show how they endeavour to corrupt the minds of young children with pernicious doctrines, hear this extract taken from a small work called "A first Catechism for Young Children," published by a member of "the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament," the Rev G. W. Berkeley, of the Parish of Allhallows, Southwark:—

Question.—What did the Saviour give the Apostles power to do?

Answer.—To make bread and wine into His body and blood.

Q.—Did He give this power to any one else?

A.—Yes, to the Bishops and Priests who came afterwards.

Q.—How can we be freed from sin after Baptism?

A.—By Absolution.

Q.—What is Absolution?

A.—Forgiveness of sins.

Q.—Who can give you Absolution?

A.—The Priest.

Q.—What is necessary before we receive it?

A.—Penance.

Q.—How can we insure Penance?

A.—By confessing our sins.

Q.—What is it to confess our sins?

A.—To tell them one by one.

Comment is unnecessary—there we have transubstantiation, Penance, Priestly Confession and Absolution openly taught, the fact speaks for itself, and clearly shows that *no toleration* should be shown these men, by a Protestant laity and clergy.

Almost everything, in the shape of literature, we find stealthily poisoned with their dangerous dogmas.

The following quotations, are from a Ritualistic historical work, introduced some years ago, as a text-book, into a Canadian Evan-

gelical Divinity College ; but has been wisely rejected for some time. In speaking of the primitive church, it says :

“The Holy Eucharist was to the Church then as it is still, the *chief act and centre of Divine worship*. In this *new sacrifice* the Apostles showed forth and pleaded before God, the one sufficient sacrifice, which they themselves had seen once offered.”

“The ritual of the early Church naturally gathered round the Holy Eucharist as the *central Act of worship*.”—Blunt’s Key to Ancient Church History, pages 14 and 56.

But enough of these doctrinal quotations, to prove that they do not in reality belong to our Protestant Church. So let me now give you a slight sketch of the services, these would-be priests are so fond of holding, and see how much in accordance they are, with the genuine Anglican customs.

If you attend the services, of a High-Church clergyman, or congregation, you will not find a vast amount of difference between them, and those held by the Low Church party. You may probably see a few more emblems, and a little more decoration about the building, than the strict Evangelical would admire. You may find the service partly choral, but that practice is also followed in many of the other churches ; neither is it a point upon which a clergyman should (in my mind) have any dispute with his people. Some like a little more music and singing such as chanting the Psalms and responses ; others are better satisfied with a plain service, like our own. I think it is a very foolish thing, for any one, to make this a matter of principle. If the majority think they can worship better with the one service than the other, by all means let them have it. The chief difference, you may find, between the High Church and Evangelical, will be in the preaching, when more stress is usually laid by the former, upon the importance of the various services, the ministry, and a little more upon the benefits and nature of the Sacraments, than is the case with the latter. But a Ritualist, and his service, is beyond anything you can imagine for the Church of England. Here is an account of a communion service (the mass of the Ritualist) held at St. Peter’s, London Docks, England, a few weeks ago, as given by the correspondent of the *Standard* :

"The Vicar and assistant Priests wore vestments of pea-green satin, relieved by trimmings of marone velvet. At the early portion of the service, four large candles at either side of the altar were lighted, but when the act of consecration was approaching two additional large candles and sixteen smaller, seven at each side of the altar, were lighted, so that twenty-two lighted tapers blazed upon the Communion Table, when, amid clouds of incense, Mr. Lowder elevated, for the adoration of his flock, the Sacramental elements. At the proper time for announcements, Mr. Lowder stated that those wishing to come to confession should leave their names at the Church, and he then asked the prayers of the faithful for the rest of some departed souls.

"The congregation exhibited all the signs of great devotion, every one bowing down low at the elevation, when, on the altar steps, the choristers rang hand-bells, and outside the bell of the church tolled loudly."

Well, some may say, that is in England, and is bad enough, but surely in this country, they have never ventured so far? Never indeed! Why, you will find very nearly as bad in Montreal;* while in Toronto, a few would like to come out in full "*Millinery*" if they could safely do so, but read the account of the Press excursion, as given in the Belleville "*Ontario Chronicle*" of Friday, August 24th, 1877, and vouched for as a correct statement:

"Being in the City of Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, and being anxious to attend morning service, we enquired for the English Church. Having been directed, we repaired thither, and upon entering the Church we thought we must have made a mistake, that we had gone into a Catholic Church. Such, however, was not the case. The service was thoroughly *Ritualistic* or rather we should say *Romish*. During the celebration of the Communion, the Rector officiated clad in the vestments of a Priest. He wore over his surplice a green chasuble and colored stole, during the celebration 48 candles were lighted on and about the altar, which was highly and elaborately ornamented. Four clergymen were seated within the chancel and the officiating clergyman was attended by two young lads who continually kept moving about him and bowing before the altar. The wafer bread and chalice were elevated, as we presumed, for the adoration of the worshippers, who were continually crossing themselves during the service. The service being ended, the choristers, acolytes and clergy marched out in procession, preceded by a young man bearing a cross."

And yet these are the *traitors*, that a Bishop of the Church of England, a few days ago, in a sermon preached before the

*—Church of St. John the Evangelist.

“Provincial Synod” in the Protestant Cathedral at Montreal, asked *toleration* for! You are perhaps surprised, that I, a young Presbyterian in the Church, should say a word against that sermon, or speak disparagingly of anything a Bishop may choose to advance, but thank God for the Church of England’s liberal boundaries, that do not bind our tongues in this respect, and though I may be censured for the act, I have no hesitation in warning my people against the *dangerous teaching* of that sermon, which is being so largely circulated throughout the country. One question asked me at my Ordination included the words—“Will you be ready with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God’s word?”

To which the answer was, “I will, the Lord being my helper.” So, if I neglect, at the present moment, to warn you against that sermon, and the party whose claims it advocates, I would consider myself answerable to the Almighty for a *violation* of my most solemn promise.

“Why,” says the Bishop of Fredericton (the author of the sermon alluded to,) “why,” “*if those who call themselves Evangelical—if those who call themselves High Churchmen, and those who suppose themselves to be men of broader sympathies than their brethren, can work together in the same church for the common weal, in Synods, in Conferences, in Congress, at Consecrations and Holy Communions, why should the Ritualist be excluded?*”

Because, as has been shown from his own words and actions, *the Ritualist is not a Churchman at all.* He has proved himself in sympathy with *another communion*, and what true Churchmen ask him to do is, *Go there; leave us alone.*

The Bishop feels deeply for the poor persecuted *Jesuits*, and will not justify any harsh or uncharitable expressions toward them. He makes, as he says, “*great allowance for the feelings of men who, thoroughly in earnest themselves, devoted to hard and often ill-paid work, seek to attract and to christianize rude and half heathen populations; and having succeeded in this arduous task, and made up congregations of most promising materials, who are devoutly attached to their pastors, and delight*

in a service in which they can all join, find themselves persecuted by people who send hired spies to watch, not to worship, in their churches."

The Bishop is quite correct in his statement, as to the Ritualists having "made up congregations, devoutly attached to their pastors," and who "delight in a service in which they can all join." But unfortunately for the Church of England, *few of these congregations are within her communion.* We may thank the Ritualists, for helping to build up, and sending reinforcements, to the ranks of the Presbyterians, Baptists and Methodists, for the "Reformed Episcopal" denomination, and the many other sects he has been so zealous in building up, not to mention the thousands, he has sent over to Rome; while so far as the experience and observation of most people go, the Church of England when taken in hand by Ritualism, has in most instances quietly *rotted out.*

Time will not permit my taking up the whole of this notorious defence of men, whose words and deeds have shown them utterly unworthy of the confidence of true churchmen, or indeed good people of any denomination.

We can respect the honest Roman Catholic, you can grasp his hand, with the confidence of knowing *what he is*, but can we do that with the man who, is endeavouring to impose upon us? indeed no! If the Ritualists were honest, they would, believing as they do, that Roman doctrine is right and Protestantism wrong,—go over to the Roman Church, or at least leave the Church of England, like that good man, yes still, (I believe,) a good man, if he is a Roman Catholic, the Rev. John Henry Newman, or the present Cardinal Manning, and many others. We can at least give these men the credit of sincerity, even if we hold them grossly mistaken, but the Ritualist, overturner of our *religion* and *morality!* Shame to the Churchman who shows him any quarter:—

In the face of all their unlawful actions—in the face of the numbers they have driven from the Church—in the face of their late *immoral, loathsome* publication, the "*Priest in Absolution*," we are surprised that any one, (especially a Bishop,) should plead for such men. The Bishop of Fredericton, has not only proved

himself a *Ritualist of the worst stamp*, and by his sermon virtually *read himself out of the Protestant Church of England*, but any man, who takes that document as a specimen of church-teaching, and confesses compliance with its sentiments, places himself on the same list, and countenances the upholders of the "*Priest and the altar, the sacrifice of the Mass, the confessional, penance*, and last but not least, "*The Priest in Absolution.*" Yes, places himself on the list with Teachers *false* to the principles and doctrines of the Church, who would, by their "priestcraft," subvert and destroy, not only the foundations of our Protestantism, but the peace, unity and welfare which should prevail in every christian congregation.

My brethren, if I have spoken rather strongly, pardon me, but I feel there is much at stake, and the time has now come, when a man must take a stand one way or the other. There can be *no compromise*; so while some may see proper, to scatter throughout the country the poisonous seeds of Ritualism, under the shelter and with the aid of *Episcopal utterances*, I must be allowed to proclaim to my people, my *humble but solemn protest, against the same*.

Beware then, of these *false teachers* who shall be among you, as there were false prophets amongst those of olden time.

NOTE.—The reader is referred to the *Toronto Mail*, of Wednesday last,—English News Column, for an example of the "*Second Reformation*," some of these men would bring about, in the Church.





